

P L A N N I N G C O M M I S S I O N
ACTION MINUTES
JANUARY 4, 2005

Chair Gibson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present, Commissioners: Gibson, Parsons, Horton, Wozniak, Long,
Dickenson, Frautschi

Absent, Commissioners: None

Present, Staff: Community Development Director Ewing
(CDD), Principal Planner de Melo (PP), City Attorney Savaree (CA),
Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS:

With the consent of the Commissioners, Item 6A was moved forward to follow Item 4B.

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments): None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:

4A. Planning Commission Minutes 12/7/04

MOTION: **By Commissioner Dickenson, seconded by
Commissioner Horton, to accept the Minutes of December 7, 2004 as
presented.**

Gibson Ayes: Dickenson, Horton, Long, Wozniak,

Noes: None

Abstain: Frautschi, Parsons

Motion passed 5/0/2

Chair Gibson mentioned for the record that Commissioners had received CDD Ewing's December 27, 2004 Memorandum to City Council summarizing Council's expectations from the Joint City Council /Planning Commission Meeting of December 14, 2004.

4B. Conditional Use Permit - Safeway 1100 El Camino Real – Revised Resolution and Conditions of Approval.

PP de Melo briefly reviewed the Resolution and Conditions of Approval which were prepared based on the Commission's discussion at the December 12, 2004 meeting. At C Frautschi's suggestion, the following last-minute minor language changes were made to Exhibit A, Section I (changes shown in italics):

- A.3. Change to read "The *fresh* produce/flower display carts..."
- A.4. Change to read "...to display *fresh* produce and flowers" and added to the second sentence "... *and shall be located and exhibited according to the proscribed conditions described in Items I.A.3. and I.A.8. of this Exhibit.*" A.6. Changed to read "...shall not be permitted to be displayed within *or around* the outdoor display areas..."
- A.7. The second sentence changed to read "...and shall be *clean* and clutter free..." instead of "cleaned."

The second bullet point changed to read "*Christmas trees shall not be bundled up and located beyond the limits of the designated outdoor seasonal display area.*"

PP de Melo added that he had spoken with Jeff Fergot of Safeway and he was comfortable with all of these changes.

Referring to Condition 8, VC Parsons stated that he did not like the idea of tape on the ground as it would get sticky and messy, especially during the winter. He preferred that the area be defined physically on a drawing with detailed dimensions. C Frautschi pointed out that Mr. Fergot had requested that they be as specific as possible since he would not always be around and the store manager could visually see the markings. It was suggested that they use paint to define the corner parameters of the outdoor display area.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Vice Chair Parsons, to adopt the Resolution of the Planning Commission, approving a Conditional Use Permit to allow outdoor produce/flower carts and seasonal displays for the Safeway Grocery Store at 1100 El Camino Real, with Exhibit A as amended by A3, A4 A7, and with a

change to sub-item I.A.8. from “with ground surface tape” to “with painted perimeter corners.” (Appl. PA2003-0121)

**Ayes: Frautschi, Parsons, Dickenson, Long,
Horton, Wozniak, Gibson**

Noes: None

Motion Passed 7/0

On behalf of the Commission, C Frautschi thanked PP de Melo for his hard work and support on this particular project.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

6A. Design Review – Wells Fargo Corporate Properties - 1045 Ralston Avenue

Project Description: Design Review Approval to allow the addition to the Wells Fargo Bank building of two roof equipment shelters and related signage, colors and materials.

CDD Ewing summarized the staff report, noting that it was originally submitted as an administrative approval but staff determined that, because of the size and height of the proposed screening towers it should come before the Commission for action. He spoke with the applicant after the staff report was prepared, and they asked that the Commission consider the following two points: 1) The horizontal siding around the exterior of the proposed towers would actually be vent louvers; there are vent louvers on the main building. Staff recommends that, if louvers rather than siding on the tower are acceptable to the Commission, the ones on the towers should be a slightly smaller scale. 2) The applicant indicated that the round emblem on the front of the tower could be a clock, which Wells Fargo would propose and offer to the City. Wells Fargo was willing to go any direction that the Commission thinks is reasonable in terms of shape or whether there’s a clock there or not. CDD Ewing concluded that the size, shape, and location of the towers are reasonable under both the principals for design review and the architectural treatment policy, and recommended their approval.

Steve Lewis, Lewis Architecture, explained that the problem is that the present HVAC units that are mounted inside the building and are very inefficient; they need to be mounted outside for maximum air flow. He believes their plan architecturally ties in with the overall building. Referring

to staff's design suggestions for the Commission's consideration, Mr. Lewis felt that: 1) In order for the mechanical units to operate efficiently and achieve maximum air flow, solid stucco would not work because it would not provide enough air flow; 2) It would be a mistake to increase the size of the columns in that 16" is very substantial and they are trying to tie them into the building so that it is not going to look like new construction, and 3) A clock face would add cost and a maintenance issue to the project, and there are already a lot of clocks in Belmont. He added that if it is an element that would facilitate the overall design approval on the project they would go for it. Regarding the color, he stated that he cannot change the color of the roof because it is beyond the financial scope of the project, but they will clean up the building from a paint standpoint—probably lighten up the chocolate brown to make the overall coloration a little more contemporary.

C Frautschi asked the applicant to explain why better flow could not be achieved in the mechanical room by the same kind of venting that is proposed for the side of these towers. Mr. Lewis responded that the current system in the mechanical room is providing only heat and the condensing unit is in the attic. The problem is when a system has to be replaced everything goes down. They are replacing them at all their locations with basically self-contained packaged 3 x 5 mechanical units, normally in the top of flat roofs to achieve massive air circulation. They are proposing two units—if one goes down the other one will function—and they by nature are required to be mounted outside. He added that there is nothing that he could put into that mechanical room that would accomplish the same thing. C Frautschi confirmed that Mr. Lewis was saying that the particular kind of units that are chosen by Wells Fargo cannot be efficiently put in the current mechanical room because there is not adequate air flow.

Mr. Lewis responded to further questions from C Frautschi as follows:

- The equipment in the current mechanical room will be removed and that the room will be used for storage.
- Regarding sound-dampering qualities, the units will be mounted on a spring so there will be no vibration going down from the unit into the building and they are sound-rated. They are acceptable in other municipalities where they have a maximum sound reading, and the sound definitely would not cross the property line into Twin Pines Park.
- He explained that one sign would be replaced with a new sign on the tower, which is actually smaller than the existing sign, and the other one would face the parking lot, which currently is a very small sign. They will still be way under the overall allocation for signs for that site.

- He doubted if the original design firm for the Wells Fargo building is still alive, and his firm has done 35-40 of these projects and never contacted the original architect.

- The units could be put on the roof but structurally it's a little trickier because they would be dealing with a seismic analysis on the building. In addition, putting it on the upper roof and with a screen around it they would raise the overall height of the building 6 feet.

Responding to VC Parsons' questions, Mr. Lewis confirmed that:

- The sign on Twin Pines Park is illuminated.

- The street sign and the crest are included in the square footage allowance.

- The monument sign on 6th Avenue stays as is.

Responding to C Long's question as to what would happen to the building if the HVAC system is not replaced, Mr. Lewis stated that it is past its life expectancy and should be replaced and, as part of an upgrade, this would make it more efficient. He estimated that the equipment is 40 years old, since it is the original power plant. He believed there would be less of a noise impact on the neighbors than the current system—the units are insulated by themselves and with the screen there would be no sound or awareness at grade, and that it would actually be further away from the apartment complex across the street than the existing boiler. C Long also expressed concern about the architectural features of the building and was leery of making it any worse.

Responding to C Horton's questions, Mr. Lewis stated that:

- The total tonnage is about 20.

- The units will be on a building management system or time clock so that they will go off in the evening when the branch is closed.

- The louvers that are in the existing mechanical room will remain there.

- To a certain extent, they can use the existing distribution system in the building.

- The asbestos will be left passive except perhaps in the mechanical room.

- If there is no clock there will not be anything where the circle is shown.

Lengthy discussion ensued. Key points made by the Commissioners were as follows:

VC Parsons:

- Would rather see a couple of small towers than a big box on the roof
- Moving the signage up draws attention to the towers – keep at a lower level
- Would like to see a Landscape Plan

C Long:

- Concurred about landscaping
- If paint is going to change color, he would like to see that in the proposal
- Do not need to add a vertical element within the horizontal structure.

C Frautschi:

- The proposed design is out of character with the current building configuration.
- He would rather produce a building that architecturally holds together on its own than add correct DTSP elements that are out of harmony with the current structure.
- The HVAC units should be placed within the old mechanical area of the current building. If that cannot be accomplished, then place them on the roof of the second level, symmetrically side by side in a commonly screened area.
- Consider a landscape update.
- Recommended continuance for project redesign to meet Design Review principals in Section 13.5.3 of the Belmont Zoning Ordinance.

C Wozniak:

- Agreed that the project needs to be redesigned and that the landscaping needs to be refreshed.

C Dickenson:

- Agreed with the spirit of his fellow Commissioners that it is very unsightly the way it is and that the sign should be moved as it would cause the eye to go directly to it. His position was that the project should be brought back for redesign.

C Horton:

- Did not agree with putting the units on top of the roof—a 6' screen and a lot of steel under the roof would be needed and would look worse. She asked if Wells Fargo had looked at a chiller system where they would put a pad outside and use the mechanical room for the associated equipment. She felt that the signage would be better between the two elements.

Chair Gibson:

- Thought it would look terrible to put the units on the roof. He felt that the proposed plan helps the look of the building, which is otherwise rather boring, and nicely reflects the Safeway building. He agreed that the sign could be elsewhere and would leave the landscaping to Vice Chair Parsons.

Mr. Lewis responded that if there is a concern that it's breaking up the horizontal aspect of the building, the two units could be shifted towards Ralston so they are balanced right on the other side of the mechanical room, and they could drop that down and then not do a treatment there. The third option would be to do a screened chiller with outside condensers; the only viable part on the site is the landscaped area between the building and Ralston. He felt that that would be offensive and not as efficient. He stated that it has nothing to do with cost—they were not picking the cheapest approach to do it, they were picking the most energy efficient approach. Putting it on the roof is not viable structurally as there is no ceiling void so that the ducts would have to be exposed on the roof—they have explored that option in the past and would not consider it for this project.

C Horton asked if they could put both units side by side on the Ralston elevation and embed it into the roof. Mr. Lewis responded that that was the first approach that they took but the problem is that it can't be done in this building because of the way the existing roof is framed in—they might have to tear the whole side of that roof off and rebuild it. It is just not financially viable. They thought by putting it over the entry doors. If the Commission has a concern with that, the other option is to slide them where they were originally, on either side closer towards the mechanical room, and it would basically read as a dormer.

VC Parsons felt that if they're going to get into design and if they're going to have a dormer it probably should be over the entrance. The building is asymmetrical anyway in terms of its details in that the entrance is off center on both sides. He felt that if the decision they come up with is to have a dormer the detail needs to be a little bit lower, if at all possible, but also that the treatment of the roof line at the top of the tower be similar to what's on the existing roof around the edge of the building. If they did that and pulled

it down a little bit, and eliminated the signs up there, it would be almost unobtrusive.

Chair Gibson concurred.

C Long stated that he did not think he could support any kind of dormer or wedding cake design. He would like to look at the cooler and other options and was leery of changing anything on the roof side to make it either taller or out of symmetry.

C Frautschi asked the applicant if the units both be placed side by side on the Twin Pines Park side of the roof. Mr. Lewis replied that they could extend and make the platform basically twice the size and mount it outside the mechanical room, which might create a bigger bump on the side of the building, but it is possible.

MOTION: By Commissioner Long, seconded by Commissioner Frautschi, to continue the project at 1045 Ralston Avenue for construction of roof equipment, shelters and signage to a date uncertain for additional design modifications based on the Commission's comments.

Responding to Chair Gibson's question as to whether staff had a notion of what they would do, CDD Ewing stated that he was not sure what he would ask of the applicant, who had heard all the comments. He added that he had not heard a consensus, and that made it difficult for staff to know what to bring back.

Ayes: Long, Frautschi, Dickenson, Parsons, Gibson

Noes: Horton, Wozniak

Motion passed: 5/2

CDD Ewing asked for any additional guidance that the Commission could offer.

Chair Gibson polled Commissioners for their preferences.

C Frautschi preferred that it be a chiller at ground level and no where on the building.

C Horton would like to see how they would put the equipment pad down and the fencing around a chiller on the ground, or a redesigned, more horizontal cupola placed down into the roof.

C Long's first choice would be to stay within the existing physical plant, and could not support any kind of a shed dormer or additional building on the outside or an additional layer of a wedding cake. He could support, if it is tastefully done and screened, an exterior HVAC unit so long as there is great care and caution put into making it not so obviously ugly.

Chair Gibson liked the box on top of the doors, making the roof line more like the existing building.

Vice Chair Parson could support C Frautschi's idea of putting the two together and lowering the height of it, and tied into the existing columns of the building, with the signage down. He would have to see how a chiller would look on Ralston; Ralston is a scenic corridor and he did not like the idea of putting mechanical equipment there.

C Dickenson agreed with the suggestions of trying to consolidate; minimizing the effect is the goal, be it on the ground or on the roof.

C Wozniak was not totally against having something on the roof, but would like to see it minimized, spreading it out to make it fit more with the roof line. She added that if the landscaping were redone with trees in front the whole effect would be minimized.

CDD Ewing will ask the applicant to come back with a plan on the ground level on the Ralston side, and a roof design that further reduces the profile.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

5A. PUBLIC HEARING – Zoning Code Amendment – Single Family Residential Parking Standards

Project Description: To consider revisions to Sections 2.16, 8.1.4, and 8.3.1(e) of the City of Belmont Zoning Code, amending the definition of a "bedroom" and threshold for requiring a parking upgrade (to conform with the standard of two garage spaces and two additional spaces) for single family residential projects. (Appl. No. 2004-0079)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15308 - Actions of Regulatory Agencies for the Protection of the Environment.

Applicant: City of Belmont

(Continued from 12/7/04 Planning Commission Hearing)

PP de Melo summarized the staff report, concluding that the suggested amendments to the Belmont Zoning Code (BZO) were set forth in the attached draft resolution.

C Frautschi asked what happens to properties that have no covered parking. PP de Melo responded that there are triggers that are going to be activated based upon the type of the addition, whether it be size or the addition where we recommend the resulting number of bedrooms or more than one bedroom is added. If the home does not have a garage and any of these triggers are activated, the resulting change would be that this home comes into compliance and would have to have a garage that is 20 x 20 and must have parking in terms of a driveway leading to that garage, which is 17 x 18, which would be the four spaces in place. He confirmed that the applicant can always ask for a Variance.

C Long asked if someone has a 40' deep by 15' wide garage, are they still going to add another space. PP de Melo responded that a 2-car garage is 20 x 20. C Long would like to see if they could incorporate a provision for tandem parking.

Chair Gibson opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak.

Motion: By Vice Chair Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Dickenson, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.

C Horton read the following from another city's ordinance that she felt they might be able to combine with the proposed new language: "Non-conforming single-family dwelling garages legally constructed according to the parking regulations at the time of construction may continue as non-conforming provided that the square footage necessary to legalize the garage based on this section of the ordinance be reserved from the allowable floor area ratio for a future garage update." After discussion, CDD Ewing stated that he would like to look at the language side by side. C Horton agreed to give it to him and mentioned that it also includes some language about tandem parking.

C Long stated his concern that the proposed legislation would cause applicants to reduce the size of their addition or the number of bedrooms in order to stay under the 3500 allowable square feet. He said he would want to give them additional space to complete the garage so that they do not

have to cut a piece of the bedroom off or so they're not seeing a low return on investment for their garage purchase or their bedroom addition.

CDD Ewing responded that the City has addressed some of that concern by providing an administrative exception to floor area limits up to 450 sq.ft. when it is to provide the required parking. Discussion ensued with C Long concluding that he was buoyed by the fact that this may be the solution to one of his biggest problems with this ordinance.

Chair Gibson commented that he does not feel tandem parking is a great solution, and added for the record, that, contrary to the ordinance, garages in Belmont are full of stuff and not full of cars.

C Dickenson felt that their goal is to add parking spaces so he would not dismiss the idea of tandem parking casually. He felt that there had been a number of projects where if the applicant had had to put in a tandem garage they would have.

C Frautschi felt that their goal is not only to hide cars, but also to upgrade the parking to code standards to make more street parking available, to potentially reduce street parking clutter, to potentially increase street safety for walking and reducing vehicle accidents. He believed the City would benefit by having a maximum floor area trigger. He suggested deleting the word "as" on Page 3, paragraph 1, at the end of the sentence which begins "Dens, studies, or other similar rooms" He would like to hear discussion on the line which begins "Any room which is only accessed through another bedroom...." Also, he felt that the reference to 50% or more of a wall should be in the definition of a bedroom; it should be part of the Commission's process when looking at a design to make the determination. Referring to the Goal on page 5, item 4 "encourage renovation of older areas," he felt the goal is to make a better City not necessarily to make the code so tough on people. He agreed with Section 8.3 on page 4 about loosening the standards for non-conforming garages, and liked C Horton's idea about holding square footage out so that it's always accounted for.

C Horton liked the idea of multiple triggers because then they're looking at it from several different points of view. She liked the modification that they will not require people to go to a 20 x 20 garage; 17 x 18 is fine. She also liked the idea that the garage has to be brought up to code to 20 x 20 if it doesn't meet the minimum 17 x 18, and if any of the triggers are activated it has to go to 20 x 20.

C Long suggested the addition of language that would open up tandem as an option. On pages 2 and 3, where it describes exception based on size of

existing garage, he would add a sentence that says "or a tandem equivalent when width is no less than 8.5' and the overall dimension is 400 sq.ft. or greater." He confirmed that he was talking about when there's a narrower lot or there's an existing 1-car garage. He would provide two options: 1) in such houses where they already have a 400-sq.ft garage that happens to be deep rather than wide, and 2) if someone is unable to build 20 x 20 garage they might have this as an option. He would add a "should" in such cases where a 20 x 20 garage may be built, the applicant should choose to do that, but in such cases where the property is configured to make it more feasible to do a tandem space of 400 sq.ft. then that would be allowed.

VC Parsons did not like the idea of putting tandem garages in the basic language. He felt that they could always be used as an exception or a variance to satisfy the issue but did not want to encourage people to build tandem garages because they do not get used for cars. He agreed with C Frautschi about going through a bedroom to another bedroom and suggested deleting the negative language. He felt that the issue of deducting space from the FAR and holding it back is interesting and, suggested that staff look at it to see how it impacts their exception set-up and the whole issue as it relates to FAR.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the feasibility of including an option for tandem garages in the ordinance.

Chair Gibson stated for the record that until such time as the City Council steps up and directly addresses street parking with restrictions or permits, they're never really going to get the parking issue solved. He felt staff had done a good job on the ordinance and that it was an incremental improvement.

PP de Melo summarized the outcome of the discussion as follows:

- Section 2.16 (Definitions – Bedroom), page 3 of staff report: Deleting the word "as" from the second sentence and deleting the last two sentences of that paragraph.

C Wozniak asked if what they are saying then is that any room where there are less than 4 walls will not be considered a bedroom? CDD Ewing responded that the definition starts with "Any room" and so that a loft or landing, for example, probably would not qualify. He added that there is not a definition of "room" in the zoning ordinance so they would revert to whatever the building code says is a room—he would defer to the Building Official if that became an issue.

- Adding a provision to allow for withholding of floor area as part of the exception for the 17 x 18 garage, or 0 to 94 square feet, depending on the size of the existing garage.
- Adding a floor area square footage trigger.

CDD Ewing agreed that staff will do some research and come up with some information about what size of projects have been brought to the Commission, how big the house was when it started and when it was finished, and then the Commission can use that as a rough gauge for whether they want to pick an absolute number for triggering review. C Wozniak suggested that an interesting factor might be some research to find out how many houses that added more than 1000 square feet still only have one-car garages or are non-conforming. CDD Ewing agreed to do that, adding that they will probably not bring this item back to the Commission until February.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

6B. Selection of Planning Commission Representatives to Permit Efficiency Task Force

At the request of the City Council, CDD Ewing asked the Planning Commission to select three representatives to serve on the Permit Efficiency Task Force, recently created by the City Council. C Dickenson and C Horton agreed to serve on the Task Force, as well as Chair Gibson. CDD Ewing noted that there will be three business representatives and 4 residential representatives—people who have been involved with the process at some point along the line—and suggested that if Commissioners know someone whose experience they would want to get into the mix they could let him know their names by email or a phone call.

On the issue of those Commissioners' whose terms will be expiring, CDD Ewing informed Vice Chair Parsons, and Commissioners Frautschi, Horton and Wozniak, that if they are interested in applying for another term they are requested by the City Clerk to send something to her in writing confirming their interest.

7. REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES AND COMMENTS

7A. Safeway Code Compliance Update – 1100 El Camino Real

PP de Melo reported on the outstanding issues as follows:

- He had received the revised Landscaping Plan that day and will be looking at it.
- They have done some painting of the railings and some minor paint to the rear façade and will do the rest of the touchup paint when the rains slow down.
- The loading gate continues to work manually. They are still working on a solution for a remote gate mechanism with an estimate of 30 to 60 days to get that issue resolved.
- Unpermitted outdoor displays have not been an issue in the last few months.
- Staff has observed no deliveries or opening of the gate either before 6a.m. or after 9p.m. They have been making a more concerted effort to have that gate closed during the daytime hours—it's not perfect in every case but it is getting better in terms of what he has observed.
- The clock tower continues to work.
- With regard to the landscaping, they are going to be doing plantings of the new parking lot trees and the replacement trees in late February or early March to try to get the best bloom possible. They still have a few things outstanding but they are making good progress. They have a contract with the landscaper in place; he believes they are going to be increasing their budget relative to maintenance of the trees in the parking lot.
- The shopping cart retrieval plan is in place.

PP de Melo believes they are making good progress and will keep this on the agenda for the next three or four meetings until everything is done.

7B. Comments/Questions from the Commission:

- C Frautschi: Asked if the Planner contact could be incorporated in the actual agenda item, rather than on a separate contact sheet as is currently the policy? CDD Ewing replied that they will think about his request and try to accommodate him, but noted that the reports are actually staff reports, not that of any one staff member.
- C Frautschi: Referring to the trees on 6th Avenue by the cleaners and Belago, he noted that there are 3 or 4 trees that have been cut down and 2 others that are in bad shape that need to be replaced. He put staff on notice

that he plans to pull the original CUP to look at the landscape plan for that property.

- C Frautschi: Referring to the trees on the property at the corner of Alameda and Ralston, the pizza mall, he noted the landscapers have cut down all the trees that were there and they need to be replaced.

- C Frautschi: Thanked staff and/or Code Enforcement for contacting the Maheed people on El Camino – their landscaping is now straightened out.

- C Long: Is the sign at the Walgreen's Plaza to code? PP de Melo responded that it is not – it was approved in 2003 to have a gooseneck feature but the interior illumination portion was not permitted. The landscape plan has not received it's final inspection sign off from the Planning Division and he will follow up on the sign.

- C Long: Referring to the large lights facing the street at the Wells Fargo building, is there anything that can be done to have them shielded or face downward? CDD Ewing stated that there is no lighting ordinance and no CUP on the project—the lights were reviewed and there's nothing to prohibit them. He agreed to ask the owner if they would tilt them downward.

- C Wozniak: Thanked Karl Mittelstadt for cleaning up the situation at the corner of El Verano and Alameda.

- C Wozniak: Noted that the table regarding under- and over-parked neighborhoods in the Parks and Open Space Element of the General Plan is not correct, so that the Commission needs to be careful when referring to that chart.

- Chair Gibson: Asked for the status of a revocation hearing for Arco, as directed by Council. CDD Ewing responded that it will be on the January 18th agenda for the Commission to set a date for a future hearing. C Horton suggested that staff may want to talk to Redwood City about the Arco at the corner of Whipple and Veterans since it appeared that it was a similar situation and could be the same owner.

- Chair Gibson: Confirmed with CDD Ewing that the Charles Armstrong item is on the next agenda. C Frautschi: When is the sign being donated by the Rotarians coming to the Commission? CDD Ewing replied that that he did not yet know when it would be agendized.

- C Wozniak: Asked about the lights in the Notre Dame gym which are lit all of the time. PP de Melo responded that that issue is scheduled for the January 18th agenda and can be discussed at that time. CDD Ewing agreed to check the parking ordinance to see if there is anything about glaring lights being a nuisance to a neighborhood.
- C Horton: Commented that the signage at the \$1.75 cleaners is not being turned on, and that the "weed yard" needs to be looked at.
- VC Parsons: Asked about the neon lights on the check cashing place on El Camino. Staff replied that they would have to investigate permits to see if they were approved but that they could not answer these questions off the cuff.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2005

Liaison: Chair Gibson

Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Frautschi

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m. to a Regular Meeting on Tuesday, January 18, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

Craig A. Ewing, AICP

Planning Commission Secretary

Audiotapes of Planning Commission Meetings are available for review

in the Community Development Department

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.